

THE
MAJESTY
AND *Philology vol 1.*
Singular Copiousness
OF THE
K
HEBREW LANGUAGE
Asserted and Illustrated:

OR,

An Argument to prove the High Antiquity
and Divine Authority of the HEBREW Points,
both Vowels and Accents: which, from a gram-
matical Explanation of the double Pointing of
the DECALOGUE, (never before attempted) are
demonstrated to be coeval with the Promulga-
tion of the LAW at Mount SINAI.

TOGETHER

With Three Half Sheet TABLES of the DECALOGUE
in *Hebrew and English.*

AND

Towards the Conclusion, the *simple dissenters* of the
pretended Decypherer of the Book of *Job*, and the Author of
a new *Hebrew Grammar*, lately publish'd for discrediting the
Hebrew Points, are casually expos'd, and refuted.

In a LETTER to a FRIEND.

Facta est Alea.

L O N D O N:

Printed and Sold by E. OWEN, near *Chancery-Lane*,
Holborn; and W. SANDBY, at the *Ship without*
Temple-Bar. M,DCC,XLIV.

Price Two Shillings, and Six-pence.

M A J E S T Y

Singular Copyists

WE B R E W L A N G U A G E





T O

The PUBLICK.

INE me! liber ibis in urbem;
It's true, was the Complaint of a celebrated Poet, when the Republick and City of Rome were in their Glory: And now Great-Britain and its Metropolis, are in their Decadency, as all of ye I think will readily allow, who have not quite lost the Sense of FEELING, that of Seeing having been long since out of the Question, the Majority of ye at least, (the Fools of all Nations, Cities, and Senates, seldom composing the Minority) will be gaping to know, why I, who am the Editor, should venture to usher into the World, the following epistolary Dissertation, without the fashionable Trick of a Dedication; which alone, in this corrupt and later Age of it, usually determines the Fate of the Labours of all Authors, without any regard to Truth, Merit, or sound Argument? I do therefore, however for the sake of Decency only, and least you should lash me in your late favourite

iv To the PUBLICK.

Satyrists Words, for want of it, think fit to comply with your Query, by giving a proper Reply to it.

Ovid indeed, had some Reason to murmur, as the Literati amongst ye do well know: But as his Case is widely different, from the Cause of your Question, it becomes my Business to shew, that you have not the least Colour or Pretence for Complaint, and in course none for your Query: Since a PROPER Dedication, in the Front of this Work, new, extraordinary, and useful as it is, was altogether impracticable; and therefore absurd to be ask'd for or solicited!

To illustrate this will be no hard Task, when it is consider'd, that but two Sets of Men could, with any Propriety or Decency, be importun'd for their Patronage; namely, the Professors of Hebrew, or, those dignify'd with the high Appellation of R. R. Now, on applying to the First, the Reply must inevitably have been, "Let us peruse the Work, and then, &c." Which being just, plain it is, the Perusal of the Title Page only, would readily instruct them, the Author's View was to prove, that the Hebrew Language without the Vowel and Accent Points, would be like that of Babel, or of one compos'd of a confus'd Medley of Consonants; and if so, that they must either lose their Appointments, as Professors of Hebrew,
or,

To the PUBLICK. v

or, for, and on their Compliance for the Sake of Truth, go again to School. And as the utrum horum would be death to them, I have done with the first Set; and come to the second; with which I doubt we shall be yet worse off. For, when this last, or any one of its R. R. Order, had gone through the Dissertation, it must be very obvious to them, that the chief Design of it was, by shewing the Power and Efficacy of the Hebrew Points, to give such strong Reasons, and irresistible Arguments for altering certain Parts, or Passages in our English Version of the Hebrew Code; to the intire Reëtitude whereof, they have all nemine con. fully assented, as would infallibly stagger them, in their Sollicitations for Translations of another kind; in case they should happen at last to listen, to the magna veritas, so clearly and unanswerably made out and asserted, by this unpopular, but daring Author. So that to expect a License for the Dedication wanted, from this Learned and venerable Body, would be yet more ridiculous, than even the Hopes of one from the first.

And thus you plainly see, why a proper Dedication to this Letter to a Friend, tho' upon so grave a Subject, has been found altogether impracticable. But altho' this Apology was my chief View, in thus addressing the Publick; yet for your full Satisfaction, now my Hand is
in,

vi To the PUBLICK.

in, I will extend it a little further, by giving you, before I take my Leave, a short Narrative, of the Cause of this Epistolary Dissertation; and of the cogent Reasons for its Publication; viz.

Some few Months since, a particular Acquaintance of mine, being in Company with the Author of this Work, who happens also to be his intimate Friend, (the first I shall distinguish, in the Sequel of this Address, by the initial Letters of A. B. and the last by C. D.) together with my self, the Conversation happened to turn upon the present Controversy, with respect to the Validity, or Invalidity of the Hebrew Points, &c. And to the Reasons that have lately induc'd many of the Clergy of the Church of England, (all three of us being of its Communion) and amongst them not a few of the R. R. together with Numbers of other believing Christians, to range themselves under the Banner of Deism; not only by attempting openly to oppose and discredit, but also in their Writings, (some of which compil'd by the R. R. themselves, and without blushing by their order Published) absolutely to disuse, both the Vowel and the accent Points: And C. D. leaning to this fashionable Side of the Question, A. B. who admires his other Talents, after having in few Words inform'd him of the Excellency, Copiousness, and singular Genius of the Hebrew; and

in

To the PUBLICK. vii

in short that it was not in Fact, nor could deserve so much as the Name of a Language, if the Points were left out; nor indeed could possibly be taught or learned without them; made the following fair and open Proposal to him, before me; in the following Terms, and so near as I can remember, verbatim; viz.

“ Sir, we have been intimate Friends together, since our very Infancy, and both of us
 “ now near our Climactericks; and as I am thus,
 “ no Stranger to the Innocency of your Life and
 “ Conversation, as I hope you are not to mine;
 “ so you must readily allow, that I have made
 “ the Knowledge of the *Hebrew Language*.
 “ the chief Study, as well as the Delight of my
 “ whole Life; having with close Application
 “ read over the whole Code, (the only pure
 “ *Hebrew Book* extant) very near 40 times:
 “ Neither need I inform you, that this intense
 “ Study has debarr’d, and diverted me, from
 “ almost all other Learning; nor yet by whose
 “ Authority and Command, we are directed
 “ to *search the Scriptures*; &c. I will there-
 “ fore, to convince you of my Esteem, and
 “ of the particular Regard I have for your
 “ Merit, in a few Days, submit to send
 “ you a Letter at large, in the Nature of an
 “ Essay or Dissertation, on the *Majesty and*
 “ *singular Copiousness of the Hebrew Language*;
 “ and,

viii To the P U B L I C K.

“ and, from the *high Antiquity, divine Au-*
“ *thority*, and a new Argument never before
“ attempted, of the *double Pointing of the*
“ *Decalogue*, prove the unanswerable Validity
“ of both *Vowel and Accent Points*: And then
“ Sir, Leave to you, or to any of the *Believing*
“ Adversaries to my Assertion, to make a
“ rational and well-grounded Reply: But
“ withal, and that by my Labours, you
“ should be converted to the Truth, you will
“ do me the Justice to Publish it, for the
“ Conviction of all other Scepticks.”

C. D. *with a Torrent of Joy, return'd A.B.*
ten thousand Thanks, and readily accepted his
Challenge; which is the true Reason of the
Publication of this epistolary Dissertation to
C. D. in hæc verba.

Yours, &c,





THE
MAJESTY *and* SINGULAR COPIOUSNESS
OF THE
HEBREW LANGUAGE.

Asserted and Illustrated, &c.

S I R,



AFTER many Thanks for the Pleasure of your Conversation the other Evening, I take the first Opportunity to comply with your Request, in giving you a short Essay on the important Use, as well as Antiquity and Authority of the *Hebrew* Points, both Vowels and Accents: And tho' by way of Digression, just to touch upon our new Decypherers, &c.

THE Antiquity and Authority of the *Hebrew* Points, both Vowels and Accents, have only been disputed amongst Christians; and the
B strongest

strongest Sticklers against them are, and always have been, Scepticks and Deists; and such they are, who are now endeavouring to abrogate the Authority of the *Hebrew* Points of all Sorts; as well knowing, could that be done, the Doctrine of Christianity itself, which is a Confirmation, as well as a Completion, of that of *Moses* and the Prophets, would soon fall a Sacrifice to their Rancour and Wickedness.

BUT these Ring-leaders and Managers, who are but a small Number themselves, draw a great Party to their Side, out of the honest and well-meaning Believers, both of a God, and of reveal'd Religion; and learned Men too, tho' not in the *Hebrew* Tongue: Because the Doctrine of throwing away both Vowel and Accent Points soothes them, both in their having neglected so necessary a Study, and in their Indolence, as being very unwilling, after having gone thro' the Course of their Studies, to undergo the Fatigue of Learning *Hebrew* Rhetorick, which almost solely lyes in understanding the Use of the Accent Points.

To a Person well versed in the *Hebrew* Grammar, and in the Use of all the Points, it may not be difficult for him to read without them; tho' in critical and mysterious Passages, he'll be left at great Uncertainty, without having Recourse to a pointed Copy: But let the Points of all Sorts be wholly taken away, and all the Advantages receiv'd from ever having seen them, quite laid aside, and it will quickly

quickly appear into what different Ways such Persons will run; not a Chapter, nor even a Verse, scarce a Word, would in a little Time, be left free from perplexing and contradictory Conjectures. If the Vowel Points, at least, be really no essential Part of the *Hebrew* Language, then the Conversion of Tenses necessarily drops to the Ground; as well as two material Voices of Verbs, viz. *Pihel*, and its Passive *Pubal*, both of superlative Application: And so instead of a Language, the *Hebrew* becomes (as the Decypherer of the Book of *Job* would have it) a mere Jargon, without any certain Rule of Pronunciation, or Spelling of Words, and a Senseless Gibberish, wherein all the Parts of Speech are indeclinable: And yet the Conversion of the Preter into Future, and *Vice versa*, is without doubt a fundamental and essential Property of the Language; it being impossible in some Sorts of Syntax, to express the Tenses otherwise than by Conversion; as well as frequently doing so, is the most elegant Way of Writing, and the constant Practice of all the sacred Penmen, from *Moses* to *Malachi*.

THUS much, Sir, I judged proper by Way of Introduction; and shall now come to the Point in Debate, which I chose rather to decide from the Authority of the sacred Text itself, than by the Force of any such Arguments as have been advanced by great and learned Men in this Dispute, much less such as I can pretend to myself; and for this Purpose I shall

only bring four Instances out of Hundreds that might be produced, to prove the Inconsistency and Inconveniency of neglecting the Tenses, according to the Conversion of them, by the Vowel Points, from our own Translation, in the Reign of King *James I.* One with respect to Matter of Fact only, and the rest with Relation to Doctrine, and Sense, as well as Fact.

BUT first take Notice, Sir, that tho' the Preter Tense always relates to Time past, the Future Tense does not always relate to Time to come; nevertheless it is not therefore to be render'd as a Preter Tense Absolute or in the Indicative, but as a Potential Mood; by making Use of such Auxiliaries as best suit the Sense of the Context.

First, "AND David said unto Saul, [*1 Sam.*
" xvii, 34, and 35.] Thy servant kept his
" fathers sheep, and there came a lion and
" a bear, and took a lamb out of the flock:
" And I went out after him, and smote him,
" and delivered it out of his mouth: And
" when he arose against me, I caught him
" by his beard, and smote him and slew him:
" Thy servant slew both the lion and the
" bear."

HERE, tho' *David* asserts, there came both a Lion and a Bear; he mentions but one Lamb taken, nor does he say any Thing of encountering with but one Beast at the same Time, and yet adds, that *he slew both the Lion and the Bear* - This Story, thus related, is very inconsistent,

inconsistent, and favours more of Bravado than Truth; and therefore no Wonder this Text, amongst many, should be quoted by Deists and Scepticks, in Ridicule.

Now in this Relation, all the Verbs render'd in our Version Preter, are by Conversion, in the *Hebrew*, to be read in the Future: And if they were to be translated as the Future Tense ought to be, when used in Quality of a Potential Mood, the Narrative would run thus;

“ THY servant [says *David* to *Saul*] hath
 “ been a keeper of his father's sheep, and
 “ there would come a lion or else a bear,
 “ and would take a lamb out of the flock?
 “ Then I used to go out after him, and
 “ would smite him, and deliver it out of his
 “ mouth. And when he arose against me,
 “ I used to take him by his beard, and would
 “ smite him and slay him: Whether lion,
 “ or bear, thy servant smote him.”

Now, Sir, the Story is consistent with itself, as well as with Truth and Courage, and has more too of both, than the other; as asserting, that he used to encounter both with Lions and Bears, tho' not with both at once: Neither is it at all probable, that a Lion and a Bear should be such amicable Companions, as to come together into a Flock of Sheep, and take up but one Lamb between them; nor a Whil more credible, that while the Hero was rescuing the Prey out of the Mouth of one of them, the other should stand neuter, till his Companion

panion was killed, and then share the same Fate.

Second, THE *English Bible*, *Job*. i. 1. runs thus, "There was a man in the land of Uz, whose name was Job; and that man was perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil."

THESE Words have not only given Scepticks and Deists too much Cause to sneer, but have also too justly been objected to by Believers; as asserting what neither was then, nor now is on Earth: But the Difficulty vanishes, when all the Verbs in the latter Clause of the Verse, here rendered in the Preter Tense Indicative, are expressed, as by Conversion into Futures, they ought to be read; viz. "And that Man practised since-
" rity and rectitude, he also professed the
" fear of God, and endeavoured to depart
" from evil."

Third, In the following Example, the *English* Translators, by disregarding the Conversion of Tenses made by the Vowel Points, as well as the Stops of the Original, made by the Accent Points, have greatly misrepresented the genuine Sense of the Text; viz. 2 *Kings* v. 18. [*Naaman to Elisha*] "In this thing
" the LORD pardon thy servant, that when
" my master goeth into the house of Rim-
" mon to worship there, and he leaneth upon
" my hand, and I bowe my self in the house
" of Rimmon; when I bowe down my self
" in

“ in the house of Rimmon, the LORD par:
 “ don thy servant in this thing”.

HERE, neither regarding Preter nor Future, they have instead of them, made use of what the *Hebrew* Language hath not, *viz.* the Present Tense. For as *Naaman* asks *Pardon*, or *Forgiveness*, it must imply Forgiveness for Crimes past, not for those to come : But the Translators have represented this illustrious Heathen Profelyte, now converted to the Worship of the True God, as petitioning for an Indulgence, still to continue in the Commission of an overt Act of Idolatrous Worship.

Now, Sir, this Inconsistency vanishes quite, when the Verbs are all rendered as they ought to be, and as they are expressed in the Original ; and when the Stops there made by the Accent Points, are all represented, then the true Sense of this intricate Passage (which has been as much the Subject of Ridicule with Deists and Infidels, as it has of Perplexity to many orthodox Writers and Commentators) shines beautifully, thus ; “ Concerning this thing ;
 “ ---may the LORD! forgive thy servant :
 “ *When my master used to go into the house of*
 “ *Rimmon, to worship there, then he used to*
 “ *lean on my hand; and I used to bowe my*
 “ *self down in the house of Rimmon ;* In as
 “ much as I have bowed my self down in the
 “ house of Rimmon ;—O that ! the LORD
 “ may forgive thy servant in this thing”.

How moving now are the Words of this penitent Convert! and how big are they with
 the

the humble Acknowledgment of a past Crime! This, Sir, *Elisba* seems very sensible of, and as pertinently answers, "Go in peace".

Fourth, THIS, Sir, shall be an Example; where the Preter Tense is ungrammatically rendered in the Future, (a Thing not so frequently done as the contrary) by which means the Beauty and Poetical Contrast of the Verse is totally destroyed, as well as the Sense adulterated: viz. *Prov. xii. 13.* The *English Bible* runs thus; "The wicked is snared by the transgression of his lips: but the just shall come out of trouble".

HERE the Passive Verb, *is snared*, is used instead of the Noun Substantive, *a snare*, the Pronoun *his*, is interpolated unimplied; and the Future Tense *shall come out*, used instead of the Preter, *hath come out*, as it is by the Vowel Points grammatically converted. If by the Words, *but the just shall come out of trouble*, it is to be implied, that, *they shall come out of trouble by the transgression of their lips*. The Sense is not very orthodox: And if that be not the Sense, then that Sentence is very abruptly and incoherently introduced: But this Verse rendered literally grammatical, runs thus;

"By a transgression of the lips, the Snare
of the wicked:

"A just man hath even come out of trouble.

Or with little Variation of Words, the Verse may be reduced to Measure in a Translation,
thus; By

“By a slip of the tongue, the wicked’s snare :
 “A just man hath even been deliver’d.”

SIR, I shall now conclude this Head, with a curious Example of adulterating the Sense of the Text, chiefly occasioned by neglecting the Accent Points, and forming a Sense contrary to them; which has also drawn the Translators to transgress Grammar in the Tense of the Verb, tho’ expressed by Formation, and not affected with any conversive Prefix: For they have rendered the Root it self, *preter Kal*, or the Verb *בָּיַב* *bajab*, *he was*, or *hath been*, by the Participle *Benoni Niphal*, *is become*; a Participle oftner implied than expressed; and is emphatically implied in this very Clause, besides the preter Tense expressed as above; viz. *Gen. iii*, the former Part of ver. 22.—The *English* Bible runs thus;—
 “And the LORD God said, Behold, the
 “man is become as one of us, to know good
 “and evil.” This difficult Text to understand, and reconcile with the Doctrine of *God’s not being the author of evil*; will have quite an other Aspect, when the Verb is grammatically rendered, and all the Stops made by the Accent Points, are truly represented: viz.
 “And the LORD God said; Behold the
 “man, who like one of us, hath been! is
 “come to know, good through evil.” Note, the Conjunction *וַ* *va*, may as well be rendered *by*, *with*, *through*, &c, as, *and*, or any thing that will best illustrate the Sense of the
 C Text,

Text, strictly observing Grammar, and the rhetorical Power of the Accent Points.

AND thus it is manifest from this Text, That Man did not become like one of the Persons of the Deity, by his acquiring the knowledge of *Evil*, or *Trouble*; but contrary wise, by means of this Acquisition, he lost that *Likeness*, that *Image of God*, in which God created him.

SIR, I might swell this Epistle to a large Volume by quoting Texts; but I think these sufficient to prove that, the *Hebrew* Tenses are convertible by the Vowel Points: Consequently the different Formation of Preter and Future by the Letters, is entirely useless without these Points; and this amounts to no less than Proof, that the Vowel Points have been coeval with the Letters: And the two superlative Voices *Pibel*, and *Pubal*, which are only to be formed by the Vowel Points, do no less than prove the same Thing; for if the Points were invented, as is pretended, after the Language was almost out of Use; what could be more absurd, than to invent Points to form an active and a passive Signification in Verbs, never known before? and if they were known before, the Point in Debate, is gained; and in Course given up.

THUS, Sir, it appears, that the Use of the Vowel Points is of no less Importance, than not only to determine the Pronunciation and Spelling of Words, but also to ascertain the grammatical Flexions of Verbs; without which the
Dist-

Distinction of Tenses is Useless; and therefore the Sense of the Context altogether deficient, or at least uncertain.

Now to say something of the Importance and Use of the Accent Points; the Functions whereof are of a superior Nature: These Sorts of Points (only slighted by those who are ignorant of their Use) give the Tone to Words, and make Syllables long or short; they shew the Pauses of Sense, in both Prose and Verse; and distinctly point out when and where any Repetition is to be made in either; whereby the Force and Energy of the Sense will be illustrated or strengthen'd, and the Metre in Verse be compleated.

I SHALL only trouble you with one Example, in Verse, and one in Prose, to give a little Taste of the Whole.

First, In Verse; Prov. i. 1. Thus render'd,
 "The proverbs of Solomon the son of David,
 "king of Israel." Here the Sense is but weakly express'd, it being left doubtful at least, whether *David* or *Solomon*, be the *King of Israel* meant; and the Metre is lost for want of preserving the Colon Stop of the Original at *David*, and a Comma at *King*; whereby the Repetitions are denoted, that both compleat the Metre, and illustrate the Sense: This will best appear by repeating the *Hebrew* Words, and then translating of them; for tho' Repetitions made in Words at Length are unnecessary, as well as extremely obnoxious, in the *Hebrew* Tongue, it is absolutely necessary that they

should be literally express'd in *English*, where they are implied, wanted, or intended, in the Original: A Thing seldom or never observ'd in our *English* Version,

“ Moshle Shilomoh, ben David :

“ *Shilomoh* meleck, *meleck* Jishrael.”

“ The proverbs of Solomon, David's son :

“ *Of king Solomon, king of Israel,*

Or in *English*, better thus ;

“ *Of Solomon, who was Israel's king.*

Now, Sir, the Sense is emphatically express'd, and all the Stops of the Original preserv'd, and represented ; as well as the Metre compleated. --- But it may perhaps be here objected, that these Repetitions make the second Line in the *Hebrew*, a Foot longer than the first ; and that therefore the Metre is defective, In Answer to this, it is to be observed ; that in *Hebrew* Verse, it is very disagreeable to have the Lines all of one Measure successively ; therefore the Poet commonly avoids it, rather chusing that the same Measure should repeat alternately, or at greater Distance, and in different Forms, the more diversified, the more beautiful ; it being rare to find above three or four Lines together, of the same Measure.

Second, In Prose, where Repetitions, at least such as are absolutely necessary to be made in a Version, are not so common as in Verse ; 1 *Sam.* xiv. ver. 1, 2, 3. affords a curious Example, translated in the *English* Bible as follows, viz,

“ Now

“ Now it came to pass upon a day that Jonathan the son of Saul said unto the young-man that bore his armour, Come, and let us go over to the Philistines garison, that is on the other side : but he told not his father. And Saul tarried in the uttermost part of Gibeah, under a pomegranate-tree, which is in Migron : and the people that were with him were about six hundred men ; and Ahiah the son of Ahitub, I-chabod's brother, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli, the LORD's priest in Shilo, wearing an ephod : and the people knew not that Jonathan was gone.”

HERE it appears, that *Abihab's* Pedegree, and Title to the Priesthood is repeated at full length, for no greater Reason, than to tell us, that including, or excluding him, there were about six hundred Men with *Saul* ; and the better to humour this Sense, or else there would be none at all, the Translators have made but a Semicolon, instead of a Period, after the Words *six hundred men* ; whereas according to their Sense, there should be in that Place no more than a Comma, tho' in the *Hebrew*, there is a Period.

ALL this Stiffness of Stile, and Difficulty of making any Sense at all, without transgressing the Stops of the Original, is only occasioned by omitting to repeat the Verb, *he knew*, as is emphatically pointed out by the Accents, from an Inference backwards, to be repeated : And then it will appear, That as *Abihab's* Title

to

to the Priesthood was in a direct Line from *Eli* the LORD's Priest, and wearing an *Ephod*, *he knew*, and was able by Virtue of the *Ephod* to discover, that *Jonathan* was gone on a secret Expedition, tho' he had not declared it.

Now making the Repetition in its Place, and preserving all the Stops made by the Accent Points, the above quoted Passage will run thus ; " Now on a certain day it came to pass, that Jonathan the son of Saul said, to the young man his armour bearer ; — Come, we will now go over, to the Philistines garison ; that, yonder on the other side : However to his father, he did not declare it. Though Saul, tarried in the confines of Gibeah, under the pomegranate-tree, that is in Migron : And the people that were with him, were about six hundred men. Nevertheless Ahiah the son of Ahitub, brother of I-chabod, the son of Phineas son of Eli, the LORD's priest, in Shilo, wearing an ephod, he knew ; but the people, knew not, that Jonathan was gone."

A true Critick in Grammar, but no Hebrician, may here object, that the singular Verb, *he knew*, cannot without false Grammar, serve both the singular Noun *Abiah*, and the plural Noun *People* ; and that therefore the Criticism founded on this Repetition, cannot hold good.

To this I Answer, That this Objection, as being made by One not at all understanding the

the *Hebrew* Tongue, is very just; Yet to but a Smatterer in that Language it is well known, that the Noun **עַם** *yam*, in the singular Number, signifieth either, *people*, in the plural, or else, *a people*, in the singular Number; it having also a plural Number **עַמִּים** *yamin*, *Peoples*, i. e. *sundry sorts of people*; and that therefore it may in the singular Number, command either a singular, or a plural Verb.

Now in this particular Case, the singular Verb, *he knew*, is joined in Concord with the singular Number, of the *Hebrew* Noun for *people*, on purpose, no doubt, that it might also revert back on the singular Noun *Abiah*, and leave the Negative, which for that Reason is not joined to the Verb as usual, by the most inferior Servant, making two Words become one, but by a superior Minister, who sometimes in a long Train makes a Comma; and the Verb *he knew*, to denote its double Function, is accented with a Major Lord, in Place of a Minor, and the Noun *Ephod*, is accented with the Emperor *Attnach*, in Place of a Minister, or at most but a Minor Lord, emphatically denoting the Verb unexpressed, to be implied by Inference, which cannot be done in *English*, without Repetition.

THE Accent Points, (called by the *Jews* **עֲטֻקִּים** *taim*, *The Soul's Taste*, or *Reason's Law*) are, doubtless, no less than a divine Comment on the sacred Text, shewing the rhetorical Power of every Word, and ascertaining the Sense, when without them, it might

might be read fundry, different, and contradictory Ways: These Points are the true Key to unlock the Sense of the *Hebrew* Scriptures; and are the best Evidences of their own Authority, and Antiquity too, as would plainly appear to every unprejudiced Person, that would take the Pains to come to a tolerable Knowledge of their Use; and indeed no others ought to be esteem'd competent Judges; it being unjust for any One to condemn an Art as useless, or insufficient for the Purposes intended by it, before he is capable of making Trial: Nevertheless the major Part of the Objectors, more to save themselves that troublesome Task, than out of any Aversion to the Art itself, side with those who pretend these Points, and the Vowels too, to be a modern Invention; that is to say, sometime since the Establishment of Christianity; for if it were before, that would not answer their End: So having thus set forth, and explained the Use, both of the Vowel and Accent Points, it will now be proper to speak of their Antiquity.

It appears to me most reasonable to believe as the *Jews* do, unless we could fairly confute them; viz. that the Vowel Points, and Accents too, are as antient as the Language itself, and coeval with the Letters, in their fundamental Use and Intention; tho' they might receive Improvements by Degrees, till they came to their full Perfection, with respect both to Prose and Verse; and that
must

must be in *David* or *Solomon's* Time at latest.

If this were not the Case, they were the Product of some later Date. It is highly improbable they should either be invented, or so much as receive any Improvement, during the Servitude of the *Israelites* in *Egypt*; nor yet in their Peregrination in the Wilderness. There were indeed some Intervals during the Time of the Judges, in which some Improvements in their Language might be acquired; but the only Time, if any such Time there ever was, for the *Hebrew* Points, to be invented all at once: It must be during the Reigns of their Kings, while they were Rich, and liv'd in Peace at Home, and were fear'd Abroad; tho' such Intervals as these did not last long. But had any such great Work been brought to Perfection, in any of these Periods of Time, and so generally receiv'd, as for the Law, and such of the Prophets as were then in Being (supposing them to have been originally wrote without Points) to be unanimously pointed, without any Gainfaying; it must certainly have been known when: And had the Law been unpointed at that Time, for it to have receiv'd Points, tho' only for the People's Reading (supposing it had been possible for them to have read it before) without any Disputes amongst the Doctors and learned Rabbies, appears to me no less than a Miracle: Nor is it very reconcileable to good Sense, how the High Priest himself should read the

Law distinctly and intelligibly, as it was his Duty to do, without Points, had he never seen it pointed, with Vowel Points at least, if not with Accents too.

BUT it is very observable, that those Men who profess Scepticism, and can hardly believe any Thing on general Credit, can swallow down Fables that suit their Turn, tho' without the least shadow of Probability.

NOTWITHSTANDING the Difficulties already hinted, not easy to be fairly got over; could the Invention of the *Hebrew* Points be prov'd to have been in any of these Intervals (and, doubtless, had it been so, it might have been prov'd) their Authority must have been established past Gainfaying; but that would by no Means serve the inveterate Part of the Objectors Turn: Consequently the Invention of these Points must be postponed to a much later Date, tho' a much more unlikely one; viz. to the 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th, or 10th Century, after the Establishment of Christianity.

WERE this true in Fact, it might, doubtless, be proved to be so, and the Time ascertained to less than a Century. But supposing it were so; the Men that must do it, must necessarily be Jews; And such Jews too, as in those Ages, were utter Enemies to Christianity. What Occasion had these Men to invent peculiar Points of Distinction between Prose and Verse, when the Metre was disused, and very difficult, I may say, impossible to ascertain,

ascertain, had it not been originally pointed out by the Accent Points; and the Musick to which it was to be sung, entirely lost? What Occasion had these Men to form an Active and a Passive Voice in Verbs, by their new-invented Points, if such Voices had not been in Use before? And if they had been in Use, How were they distinguishable without Vowel Points? How came such inveterate Enemies to Christianity; Men who endeavour'd as much as in them lay, to keep the Christians from any Knowledge at all of the *Hebrew* Tongue, to invent such a curious Art of pointing out a determinate Sense to the Law and the Prophets; and then to make use of it, in pointing out a Sense, that above all others they would have had concealed; and what in their Hearts they abhorred? Even to their Confusion, to prove their own Rejection, and the Adoption of the Gentiles to the Inheritance of Light, thro' the Redemption of Mankind by Jesus Christ; and their being received to Glory, by the Resurrection of the Dead. That such a Sense is pointed out, by regulating the Syntax by the Vowel Points, and ascertaining a determinate Sense by the Accents, with the minutest Pauses, and a Gradation of Stops, more than duplicate to any modern Language, is demonstrable to any One, that will take the Pains to be convinced; and well known to all them who understand the grammatical Use, and rhetorical Power of the Accent Points.

BUT maugre all Difficulties; and notwithstanding the Incapacity, as well as Improbability, of the Men of these Ages to perform this great Work; yet still on Supposition that they did it: How came it to pass, that they should unanimously agree in the Manner of applying these new-invented Points, to the sacred Texts of the Law and the Prophets, the historical Books, the Psalms, Job, and the Proverbs, without any Variation, so much as in a Word? Can an Unbeliever believe this? Can it be believ'd by any Man, without asserting it to be a Miracle? But supposing they did not agree, and that some Copies were pointed one Way, and some another, or a third, and a fourth, &c. How comes it to pass, that but one sort of Pointing, and that of the whole Code too, is now in Being in the World, either in the Possession of *Jews* or *Christians*? And yet to the Confusion of *Deists* and *Scepticks*, so it is.

Is it not then more Rational to believe, as the *Jews* do, that the Books of the *Hebrew* Code were originally wrote with both Vowel and Accent Points: But in Process of Time, and by continual transcribing, since the Promulgation of the Law; incorrect Copies began to multiply: And that this was rectified by *Ezra*, that learned Scribe; and a Man inspired by the Holy Ghost: And that a competent Number of correct Copies were carefully and faithfully kept by the *Jews*, to whom, saith St. Paul, the *Oracles of God* were committed;

mitted; and by this Means the correct Copies, and these only, were preserved, and handed down to us. And thus it is come to pass, because it was the Will of God it should be so; and therefore let us sing with *David* upon another Occasion; [*Psalms* cxv. 1.]

“ *Lox lanu, j'hovah! lox lanu:*

“ *Ci Leshimeca, ten cabod:*

“ *yal chafdeca, yal samteca,*”

“ Not unto us, O Lord! not unto us:

“ But to thy Name, the glory take Thou:

“ Because of thy mercy, and of thy truth.”

SIR, I shall now, waving farther Argumentation, endeavour, by a Method entirely New, to prove the Accent Points to be prior to, or at least coeval with, the Promulgation of the Law at Mount *Sinai*; and to effect this from the extraordinary Manner in which the Decalogue is accented different from any other Part of the Code: And then I believe it will be granted to follow as a necessary Consequence, that the Vowel Points, which shew how Words are spelt, and help to make grammatical Flexions, were in Use at least as early, as those Points that make the Pauses of Sense, and set forth the rhetorical Power of every Word in every Sentence.

BUT first, it will be proper to give you a short Description of the Nature of the Accent Points;

Points; so that a Person entirely ignorant of the *Hebrew* Tongue, may frame some Notion of it; and be sensible, how absolutely necessary it is to understand the Use, and rhetorical Power of these Points, in order to read the *Hebrew* Code, so as to make any Advantage thereby.

THE Manner of applying these rhetorical Points, call'd Accents, is Tactical, and resembles the Marshalling of an Army; and therefore they are ranged by Grammarians under five Classes, of different Qualities, one of Superiors, and four of Inferiors; and for Distinction sake, they call them Emperors, Kings, Major Lords, Minor Lords, and Ministers, or Servants: The Emperors (two in Number) and two of the Kings, one in Prose, the other in Verse, are absolute Lords; all the rest are subordinate, some to one absolute Lord, and some to another; and some are common, and serve any Lord.

THE two absolute Kings, one in Prose, and the other in Verse, are subordinate to the Emperor *Atbnach*; and *Atbnach* himself, tho' absolute over his own Train, is subordinate to the Emperor *Silluk*, who always closes the Paragraph.

EVERY Word has an Accent, and sometimes one Word has two; in the latter Case, one gives the Tone, and the other the rhetorical Power of that Word, with relation to its Place in that Sentence, as being joined to the next, by a Servant, or in proper Subordination

nation to the next Lord, according to his Quality, whether minor, major, or absolute.

As every Word has its Accent, that Accent shews what Relation that Word bears to the next: But when two Words, or more, are joined together by *Macaph*, the most abject of Ministers, such Words are reckoned but as one in Tale, and rhetorical Power: After *Macaph*, or a streight Line joining one Word to another, always comes another Minister, which still shews, that that Word is to be read in close Concord with the next; and so on, till you come to a minor, or major Lord, making a Comma, or a Semicolon; thence to an absolute Lord, whether King, or Emperor, making a Colon; and so on, till you come to the End of a Verse, or Paragraph; which is always closed by the Emperor *Silluk*, with *Soph Pasuk*, or (:) two Points shewing the End of the Verse.

SOME short Verses are composed of only a Train of Servants, and a minor, or minor and major Lord attending the Emperor *Silluk*: But generally every Verse is divided into two Parts by the Emperor *Atbnach*, (in that Case generally making a Colon Stop;) attended with his own Train, of Majors, Minors, and Servants: But no Verse, or Period, is ever divided into more than three Parts by absolute Lords; in which Case the first Colon is accented by a King, or absolute Lord, that is never used, but when the Verse contains three Propositions: -and then the second Colon is
always

always made by *Atbnach*; and the Verse closed by *Silluk*; each absolute Lord, having his own Train.

A minor Lord can make no more than a Comma, and sometimes hardly so much, according to his Distance from, or Nearness to an absolute Lord; and so of a Major, he may be but a Comma, in one Place, and a Semicolon in another; for every Major, or minor Lord's rhetorical Power diminishes as he approaches towards an Emperor, or the next absolute Lord: Thus the same Accent hath not always the same rhetorical Power; and the Emperors themselves sometimes condescend to stand as emphatical Semicolons; consequently no Lord in their Trains, can have a rhetorical Power equal to themselves.

PARDON, Sir, a short Digression: It is, tho' falsely, asserted by the new Decyphers, or *Hebrew* Gibberish-makers, as an Instance of the *Masorites* Ignorance, that they have neglected to distinguish Interrogations and Admirations: Whereas the first is shewn by an initial *ba?* at the Beginning of the Interrogatory Clause; and an Admiration is emphatically signified, when a King, or major Lord, takes a minor's Place, as *Psalms* cxv. 1. at the Word *Jehovah*; or when a major, or minor Lord takes a Minister's Place; in which Case he has always some extraordinary rhetorical Power, and generally makes a Repetition of what went before. An Admiration is sometimes also denoted by *ba* paragogick at the

End

End of a Word, and a derogatory or defamatory Admiration is put upon a Word, by a feminine Paragogick, or by a feminine Affix, instead of a masculine one, see an Example in the fourth Paragraph of the Decalogue. But to return;

HAVING I hope, Sir, given you some little Notion, how the rhetorical Power of every Word, in every Sentence, is pointed out by the Accents, I have annexed a duplicate Version of the Decalogue, both from *Exodus* and from *Deuteronomy*, differently pointed or stoped, though both of them exactly according to the Accent Points of the Original; where, in part of the Paragraphs, every Word has two Accents, one belonging to one Lord's Train, and the other to another Lord's Train, according to the different Manner of dividing it, both into the original Paragraphs of the Tables wrote in the Mount; and into the Paragraphs, or Verses of the Law; as may be seen by comparing the *English* Versions with each other, as well as by a Threefold Table of the Decalogue in *Hebrew*: The *first* shewing the double pointing, the *second* the ten Pasuchs or Paragraphs, and the *last* the thirteen Versicles: And on the duplicate Versions, I have by Notes made on all the principal Stops, shewn how the double accenting of Words alters the Division of the Paragraphs; and that where the Division is synonymous, there the Words are not doubly accented. This matter rightly considered, I

E

think,

think, is Proof to a Demonstration, that the Tables written in the Mount, were pointed with Accent Points; and consequently with Vowel Points too.

It may not be improper here to take Notice, that the Decalogue, tho' divided by *Moses* into ten Paragraphs, or *Pasuchs*, distinguished by the Letter *Samech* or *s*, nevertheless contains but nine Periods. The two last Paragraphs or *Pasuchs*, being but one Period, divided into two Parts by a Colon Stop, made by the Emperor *Attnach*.

THESE nine periodical Paragraphs, when divided into Verses, or *Silluks* of the Law, make thirteen; the first Paragraph being divided into five Verses, the second stands unaltered, and therefore no double Accents on the Words. The third Paragraph is divided into four Verses; the fourth Paragraph also makes one Verse, and consequently no double Accents there. The fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth Paragraphs, tho' all stoped as Periods, with the Emperor *Silluk*, are also connected together into one Verse, and so reckoned in the *Hebrew*; but this is disregarded by King *James's* Translators, as well as by the *Septuagint*; whose Example it is most likely the former followed, and so make sixteen Verses, of the nine Periods. *Exod* xx. ver. 2 to 17. And *Deut.* v. ver. 6 to 21. Tho' in the *Hebrew* it is, *Exod.* xx. ver. 2 to 14, And *Deut.* v. ver. 6 to 18.

THE Septuagint having divided their Verses according to both these different Sorts of Divisions; that is, Part one Way, and Part the other, plainly shews that the Decalogue was thus doubly accented, when they made their Version: But as they have generally divided their Verses, not only here, but thro' the whole Code, according to the Divisions pointed out by the Accent Points, and very seldom made any material Alteration in the principal Stops, it is a convincing Proof, that the whole Code was pointed then, in the same Manner it is now.

BUT with respect to this double Sort of Pointing in the Decalogue, distinguishing the original Paragraphs of the Tables written in the Mount, from those afterwards made, when the Law was written, is a demonstrative Proof that *Moses* did it himself: Who could do it but *Moses*? Who durst do it? Who knew how the Tables were pointed, or divided into Paragraphs, but himself? Consequently, he wrote with both Vowel and Accent Points.

Q. E. D.

BEFORE I close this Head, with Relation to the Antiquity and Authority of the *Hebrew* Points both Vowels and Accents, I shall take Notice of the Difference between the Decalogue, as it stands in *Exodus*, and as it is repeated in *Deuteronomy*.

THE most material Difference between the Decalogue in *Exodus*, and in *Deuteronomy*, is in the third *Pasuch*, or Paragraph, where in

Exodus, or on the first Tables, the Sabbath-day is said to be blessed and sanctified, on account of the LORD's having wrought six days, and resting on the seventh, after *HE* had made the Heavens and the Earth, &c. But in *Deuteronomy*, or on the second Tables, a further Reason for performing the Sabbath-day's Duty, is annexed: viz. *Because that; — thy man and thy maid-servant, shall each respectively rest, as well as thy self: And that thou mayest remember, &c.* the Servitude in *Egypt*, and the wonderful Deliverance from thence. I say this further Reason is annexed, because the second Tables seem to refer to the first, when it is said, *for the LORD thy God, hath thus commanded thee, or according as, the LORD thy God hath commanded thee*, i. e. not only now, but before, as it was written on the first Tables; where on were no such Words of Reference.

HAD there not been some literal Difference between the first Tables and the second, *Moses* would either have omitted repeating the Words at all, or else have repeated them *verbatim*: But as the first Tables were broken, it was absolutely necessary that, an exact Copy of the second, as well as of the first, should be inserted in the Law.

THE first Tables were made, or hewed, as well as wrote upon, by God himself in the Mount: But there was no Ark made to put them in; it being foreknown to God, that they would be broken.

THE second Tables were hewed by *Moses*, who was also commanded to make an Ark of *Shittim* Wood, to put them in, before they were wrote: But they were also wrote by God himself, as well as the first.

THE second Tables were like the first; but not so like as to be without Difference: Both the first, and the second Tables, had wrote on them, the Words of the Covenant, *עֲשֵׂתָהּ הַדְּבָרִים* *yaseret haddebarim*, The ten words, or The ten commandments, i. e. The Decalogue. And in each Set, or Pair of Tables, the Decalogue was expressed in ten *Pasuchs*, or Paragraphs, marked in *Deuteronomy* with the Letter *ס* s.; but in *Exodus*, the second *Pasuch* is marked at the End, with *פ* p. for *Paraschet*, i. e. a greater break, or more emphatical Paragraph, than *Pasuch*; as being the Division between the two Tables; yet in both, *The Ten Words*, or *Ten Commandments*, make but nine Periods, on the Tables; and thirteen Versicles, or *Silluks* of the Law.

THE peculiarity of the *Ten Words* of the Covenant, or the Ten Commandments, making but nine Periods, may perhaps amuse the Curious, and make 'em very desirous of having a Reason assigned for it: But as the Text is silent in that Matter, we ought to be content to be ignorant, till the Time of fulfilling every *Yot* and *Tittle* of the Law is come: Nevertheless, as speculative Curiosity, and Conjecture, can impose no Creeds, it may be allowed innocently to amuse it self, and others.

WHY

WHY may it not be probable, that before the Consumation of all Things, or at the Restoration of the People of *Israel*, the *ten words*, shall be reduced to nine, by joyning the ninth and tenth Paragraphs together, only now separated by a Colon Stop; and the tenth be added? viz. *Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thy self.*

Now, Sir, methinks you call on me to prove, that God wrote on the second Tables himself, as well as on the first: And also, How there could be any literal Difference between them; when it is said, *Exodus xxxiv, 1.* “ And I will write upon *these* “ tables the words that were in the first “ tables which thou brakest”.

As these Words were spoken by the LORD to *Moses*, I think they are Proof unquestionable, that the LORD, *i. e.* JEHOVAH, did write himself on the second Tables, as well as on the first: But as there is a Text seemingly in Favour of the contrary, I shall quote it by and by; and in the mean time, prove from a grammatical Translation of the above quoted Text, (at the same time preserving all the Punctuations of the Original, according the rhetorical Power of the Accent Points) that a literal Difference between the first Tables and the second, is no way derogatory to the Sense expressed thereby.

THE above quoted Words from the *English* Bible, make but one entire Clause without so much as a Comma; whereas in the
Hebrew

Hebrew they make three Clauses, divided by two Semicolons, besides a Comma, as follows;
 “ And I will write upon the tables ; I will
 “ even write the commandments; such as
 “ were on the first tables, those that thou
 “ hast broken.”

THAT the second Tables had Words to the same Tenour, and the same Number of Commandments with the *first*, is all that is asserted ; the *Hebrew* Word *הַדְּבָרִים* *haddebarim*, accented with a King, as emphatically implying *The Commandments* in this Verse, as it doth in Ver. 28 of this Chap. where our own Translators, have so rendered it ; the Word *ten*, being there expressed, but here implied ; for *The Commandments*, and *The Ten Commandments*, are synonymous Terms.

Now tho' JEHOVAH, said to *Moses*, *I will write on the Tables*, i. e. those hewed by *Moses* ; and *Moses* saith, (*Deut. x. 4.*) *HE*, i. e. JEHOVAH, wrote on the Tables, according to the first writing, the ten Commandments ; yet a strong Notion prevails, that as *Moses* was commanded to write these Words, (*Exod. xxxiv. 27.*) it must therefore follow, as a necessary Consequence, That *Moses* by the immediate Commandment of God, wrote on the second Tables ; but writing under such strong Inspiration, and even in the Divine Presence, it is called, not only by *Moses*, but by God himself, writing with the finger of God.

THIS Way of arguing, will prove the first Tables, as well as the second, to have been wrote by *Moses*; tho' it is positively said, as by a third Person, (*Exod. xxxi. 18.*) *HE, i. e. JEHOVAH, gave unto Moses, two tables of testimony, tables of Stone, written with the finger of God.* And *Moses* also saith himself, *Deut. ix. 10.* *And the LORD delivered unto me two tables of stone written with the finger of God.* i. e. according to the above fallacious way of arguing, written by *Moses*.

BUT to return to *Exodus xxxiv, 27*, where in the *English Bible* it is written; *And the LORD said unto Moses, Write thou these words, i. e. the ten commandments; consequently they were wrote, upon the second Tables (whatever they were upon the first) by Moses, and not with the finger of God.*

WHETHER the Translators had this Doctrine at Heart or not, I shall not pretend to determine; but either inadvertently or otherwise, they have left out, and not translated the Word *leca*, for thy self: "Write thou these words, for thy self: for according to the tenour of these words, I have made a covenant with thee, and with Israel."

THIS Text is so far from proving that *Moses* wrote at all on the Tables, written in the Mount, that it tacitly implies the contrary; and is no less than a Commandment to *Moses*, that notwithstanding the Words of the Covenant were written by God himself, on the
Tables

Tables of Stone ; yet that *Moses* should write for *himself*, and for the People, not only the Decalogue, but also all the Commandments given unto him, both in the Mount, and at sundry Times else where.

By Virtue of this Commandment, *Moses* wrote the Pentateuch, or five Books of the Law, and in them he has inserted the Decalogue as it was written and pointed, both on the first, and on the second Tables ; and has also, according to Commandment, pointed it *for himself* ; i. e. into such *Silluks*, or Versicles, as suited with the Rest of his Writings ; and this has occasioned its being double pointed with Accent Points, where the Alteration of the Paragraphs required it.

BUT it is further alledged, that the Text it self saith in *Exodus* xxxiv. 28, where the Words are dictated as by a third Person, that *He*, i. e. *Moses*, wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.

Now as the Pronoun *he*, is in this Verse used a little ambiguously, on purpose no doubt, to encourage, and animate the industrious Search of the Lovers of Truth, it will be proper to transcribe the whole Verse, and Part of the next, in order to judge nicely, whether the Pronoun *he*, i. e. *he wrote*, relates to the LORD, or to *Moses*.

“ AND he was there with the LORD
 “ forty days and forty nights ; he did neither
 “ eat bread nor drink water : and he wrote
 “ upon the tables the words of the covenant,

F

“ the

“ the ten commandments. And it came to
 “ pass when Moses came down from mount
 “ Sinai”, &c.

AT first reading, I must confess, the Words
he wrote, seems to imply that *Moses wrote*;
 but as the Relation of the Pronoun *he*, to
Moses, is, on just Reflection cut off by the
 Colon Stop, made in that Place by the Em-
 peror *Athnach*; there being an other Noun
 to relate to, the next *he*, must relate to
 the LORD; but had there not been a Colon
 Stop, *he wrote*, would have implied, *Moses*
wrote: But then, there would have been no
 Necessity of mentioning *Moses*, in the former
 Part of the next Verse; it would have been
 sufficient to have said, *And it came to pass*
when he came down, &c.

Now it is plain, that were there no other
 Text, whereby to clear up this seeming Dif-
 ficulty, that there is much stronger Reason,
 to understand the Pronoun in Question to re-
 late to *the LORD*, than that it should relate
 to *Moses*. But since we have this very Matter
 related by *Moses* himself; (*Deut. x. 4.*) his
 Words are, after having previously mentioned
the LORD; “ And HE wrote on the Tables,
 “ like the first writing; even the ten com-
 “ mandments;” This seeming Ambiguity is
 indisputably decided.

THUS, Sir, having proved, both that *God*
himself wrote, as well on the second Tables,
 as on the first, and that *Moses* by special Com-
 mandment, *wrote for himself*; I refer you to
 the Perusal of the duplicate Tables of the De-
 calogue

calogue hereto annexed, wherein the first Column represents *the writing* of JEHOVAH, upon each Set, or Pair of Tables respectively, and the second that of *Moses for himself*, in the Books of *Exodus* and *Deuteronomy*.

I shall now, Sir, only just touch upon the Decypherer of the Book of *Job*, and the Author of the five Letters about reading and translating *Hebrew* without any Points at all, and so conclude.

As nothing can establish, and demonstrate the Authority and Antiquity of the Accent Points, and consequently of the Vowel Points too, equal to translating the *Hebrew* Code, and pointing it according to their Direction; thereby making them their own Evidences of their divine Original; so nothing will sooner, or more effectually destroy the flashy Pretences of Decyphering the sacred Books as a Gibberish written in Cypher, and not in a national Language, than comparing such senseless Decypherings, and a true grammatical Translation together; and submitting them to the Judgment of honest and learned Men.

THE Decypherer of the Book of *Job*, in his Proposals, after a Circle of sly Insinuations, instead of Arguments, and with a barefaced Assurance, asserting most notorious Falshoods, as if it were practicable for him to palm them on the Credulous, and the Ignorant, for Truth, only because he has the Effrontery to assert them without Blushing; he pretends decisively to prove *Isaiab's* Prophecy to be

written in Cypher, from the Prophet's own Words, Chap. xxix. 11.

THE Fallacy of this Bounce lyes all in a false Interpolation of a Word not expressed in the Original, nor any Way implied: viz. the Word *not*, *this*; Thus; "Every prophecy shall be to you as the words of this book in cypher;" here instead of *this Book*, read a *Book*, or a *Letter*; as our own Version truly renders it, and all the mighty pretended Proof vanishes; without insisting on his having strained the Signification of the Word *בְּחָתוּם* *bechatum*, and his Decyphering it by his own invented Term, *in Cypher*; which Word truly signifies, *that is sealed*, i. e. *a Letter that is sealed*; for in *Hebrew*, a *Letter*, and a *Book*, are synonymous Terms.

BUT I cannot forbear taking some Notice of this Inovator's denying the *Hebrew* of the sacred Code, to have been a national Language; and asserting with a Sneer, that the *Israelites* in their Journey from *Egypt* to *Canaan*, never came in sight of the red sea.

FOR if *Isaiah*, as is pretended, wrote in an artificial Language, and in Cypher; yet surely, when he tells us what *Rabshakeb* said in the *Jewish* Language, [*Isa.* xxxvi. 11.] tho' he had been desired to speak in the *Syrian* Language, that the common People might not understand him; what the Prophet there relates, is wrote in the then national Language of the *Jews*, and not in Cypher: Now that Speech of *Rabshakeb* and the rest of the Book
of

of *Isaiah*, is all in the same Dialect and Character; and therefore not in Cypher: tho' it is admitted that the Character in which the Law and the Prophets is written, is different from that used in transacting, and negotiating their common Affairs.

THAT the *Israelites* in their Journey from *Egypt* to *Canaan*, never came in sight of the *red sea*; is such a monstrous wild Assertion, that it gives the Lye both to *Moses*, and to the Author of the *Hebrews*, and even to the Septuagint, who render יָם סוּף: *jam suph*, ῥουδραν θαλασσης, *the red sea*: And certainly these Translators knew better how to translate proper Names, than any Modern ones can pretend to do; and therefore what they have done in this Case, ought to be decisive: Tho' the *Israelites* could not in their Passage from *Egypt* to *Canaan* pass any other Sea, than that adjacent to *Egypt*, which was the *red sea*, as it is called now, as well as it was at the Time of LXX's making their Version of the *Hebrew Code*.

IT is true the *Hebrew Word* יָם סוּף *suph*, does not signify *red*, but *rush*, or *reed*; nevertheless it is indisputable that what *Moses* calls the *rush* or *reed sea*, and what is by the Septuagint called, *the red sea*, are the same, and mean that Sea, now called *the red sea*. How the antient Name *reed sea*, came to be changed for *red sea*, is indeed uncertain; and might be worth inquiring into; but this Difference in the Name of that Sea in *Moses's* Time, and
that

that of the Septuagint Version, is no Proof at all that *the red sea*, and *the reed sea*, is not the same; but on the contrary, a decisive Proof, that they are so, consequently the Decypherers Insinuation that *jam suph* is not *the red sea*, is mere trifling.

HE has also found out, as he thinks, something very extraordinary, and greatly to his Purpose; in that *Jeremiah* has made use of the Alphabet *Athas*; that is, by transposing the Alphabet, he has wrote שֶׁשֶׁבַּק *sheshback*, (Chap. xxv. 26.) for בָּבֶל *babel*, or *Babylon*, and לֵב קָמַי *leb kamaj*, (Chap. li. 1.) for כַּשְׁדִּים *cashdim*, *chaldeans*, or *chaldea*; as the Septuagint, in the latter Text render it, but the latter Part of the former Verse, where שֶׁשֶׁבַּק *sheshback* is mentioned, they have not translated at all.

THE Prophet, doubtless had his Reasons, for thus cabalistically transposing the Letters of these Words; and the *English* Translators had (as I think) better in the latter Case, either have followed the Septuagint, and said, *the inhabitants of Chaldea*, instead of translating the Words *leb kamaj*, and saying, *them that dwell in the midst* (i. e. *the heart*) *of them that rise up against me*; or else have kept the Words *leb kamaj*, untranslated, as a proper Name, as they have done *sheshback*.

Now tho' all this may afford some speculative Amusement, and give some Sanction to the *Cabala*, as not being wholly fictitious, and
stuffed

stuffed with nothing but Lyes; it does not at all prove that the *Hebrew* of the sacred Code never was a national Language; nor that *Jeremiah's* Prophecy is all to be decyphered by the Alphabet *Athas*; as is wildly insinuated.

I shall only just take Notice of the unparalleled Assurance of the Author of five Letters compiling a *Hebrew* Grammar without Points; first he dares to palm an Assertion, of his own tacking together, on Sir *Isaac Newton*, who, as himself can be proved by living Witnesses to have declared, was entirely ignorant of the *Hebrew* Tongue. And dares also to say, that *Buxtorff* was confuted by *Capellus*.

As to his Jargon, I shall leave it to the sincerely Judicious, whether five Vowels without one Consonant, can frame a Word that can be pronounced, *viz.* ieoue, spells i, e, o, u, e. And thus this Trifler spells the Tetragrammaton JEHOVAH.

To conclude: As the *Hebrew* Code, is by means of the Accent Points, together with the help of Masculine and Feminine Paragogicks, Permutation of Tenses in Verbs, and of Number and Gender, in both Nouns and Verbs, and other such like Decorations, approbriously stiled Imperfections, and Redundancies; so emphatically stoped, and rhetorically imbelished, with exalted and defamatory Admirations, Repetitions, Interrogations, and other beautiful Pauses, whereby the Passions, and mental Commotions, of the several Persons
and

and Characters introduced both in Prose and Verse, either as Actors or Speakers, are in a most significant and moving Manner described: So the *Hebrew*, in its own Nature, and in full Perfection, has that Majesty, singular Copiousness, and concise Elegancy, expressed in a few Characters, and a small Number of Words, that no Language on Earth can equal, nor all of them put together exceed.

THE *Hebrew* is taxed with being barren of Words; in that it has but few Adverbs, and a small Number of Nouns adjective: These seeming Defects, are no less than superlative Perfections; because; — Had the *Hebrew* Language abounded in that exuberant Verboseness, so much boasted of in the modern Languages, it must like them, have so far lost, and changed the Signification of its Words, once in two or three Centuries, or oftener, that it could not have conveyed any strong and beautiful Ideas, through a much larger space of Time; and for this Reason only, there neither is, nor ever was any Language on Earth, so capable of striking the Minds of all Readers with the same Ideas, through such a Series of different *Æphocas*, as the *Hebrew* has done, and will continue to do, throughout all future Ages.

But this pretended Paucity of Words in the *Hebrew* Tongue, is abundantly supplied by an unlimited Number of Participles, which are all of 'em, also used as Nouns adjective when occasion requires; and this proceeds from an
unpa-

unparallel'd Change of Voices in their Verbs; whereby also Nouns adjective of boundless Significations are implied; and so figuratively depicted, as to strike the Minds of all Men, exclusive of what Language they speak, with the same kind of Ideas, and this will employ the utmost Genius of every Translator, in studying how to express himself, and to make Choice of such sort of Phrases, as may best suit the Language, and the Age, in which he writes.

BUT take away the Points of all Sorts, and all Elegancy, and Decoration of Speech vanishes; nay there will not be Grammar enough left to regulate the Syntax, so, as without the Help of Conjecture, (too frequently made use of in all Versions extant) to make common Sense: On their being applied, the whole Code shines with Beauty, and abounds with emphatick Similies, elegant Decorations, moving Metaphors, and prosaic and poetical Contrast; all which must have been entirely lost, had the sacred Pen-men wrote without them.

Now, Sir, refering you to the subsequent Notes, on the different Punctuations of the annexed Duplicate Versions of the Decalogue, for a further Confirmation of what has been advanced, and I hope to your Satisfaction proved; I subscribe my self, with the utmost Sincerity, and all due Respect,

S I R,

Ever Yours, &c.

G

NOTES

unparalleled Change of Voices in their Verbs; whereby the Nouns adjective of persons, significations are implied; and so figuratively Capital, as to strike the Minds of all Men, exclusive of what Language they speak with the same kind of Ideas, and this will employ the utmost Genius of every Translator, in finding how to express himself, and to make Choice of such sort of Phrases, as may best suit the Language, and the Age, in which he writes.

But take away the Points of all sorts, and all Elegancy, and Decorations of Speech vanish; yet there will not be Grammar enough left to regulate the Syntax, so as without the Help of Conjecture, (too frequently made use of in all Versions extant) to make common sense: On their being applied, the whole Code shines with Beauty, and abounds with emphatical Similes, elegant Decorations, moving Metaphors, and poetic and poetical Constructions; all which must have been entirely lost, had the sacred Penman not been without a Pen. Now, Sir, let me give you the following Notes, on the different Translations of the sacred Scriptures in the English Language, appeared Duplicate Editions of the Bishops, for a further Confirmation of what has been advanced, and I hope to your Satisfaction proved: I subscribe my self with the utmost Sincerity, and all due Respect,

A. A. B.

WOTTS



NOTES

ON THE

DUPLICATE VERSIONS

OF THE

DECALOGUE.



IN the two Tables of the Duplicate Versions of the Decalogue, (wherein the Words in different Character represent those in the *Hebrew* that are doubly accented) the first Pasuch or Paragraph of the first Column in each Table, is divided into three Parts by absolute Lords; viz. by two Colons; the first made by the absolute King in Prose, and the second by the Emperor *Atbnach*; and closed with a Period, by the Emperor *Silluk*: But in the second Column of each Table, the same is divided into five Verses, or Silluks of the Law; as may also

be seen in the *Hebrew* Table, by comparing the first Column with the other two; and them, one with the other; observing the Manner in which the double Accents of the first Column are divided between the other two.

In the first Verse; The Words *I am*, are pointed or accented, both with a superior Minister, and a minor King; the former as pointing out a Member of the long Paragraph, and the latter as coming next before the Emperor *Athnach*, makes, tho' no Comma, an emphatic Pause, or slow Pronunciation almost equal to one.

Thy God, as being accented with a major Lord; he makes a Semicolon in the long Paragraph; but as accented with the Emperor *Athnach*; he makes a Colon, and divides the Verse into two Parts: *The LORD*, has but one Accent, as being in so close Concord with *thy God*, as to make the Words, *the LORD thy God*, almost but one Word.

Slaves, accented, as closing a Member of the long Paragraph with a major Lord; he makes a Semicolon there; but as closing the latter Part of the first Verse, this Word is accented with the Emperor *Silluk*, making a Period. Every Word in this Clause has two Accents, one attending the major Lord, the other composing the Emperor's Train.

Verse 2. Is but one Clause divided by two short Commas, and closed with the Emperor *Silluk*, making a Period; but as a Member of the long Paragraph, it is pointed with a major Lord, that makes a Semicolon: Every Word is here doubly accented, as composing respectively, the Train of the major Lord, and of the Emperor *Silluk*.

Verse 3. At the Word *beneath*, the Emperor *Atbnach*, makes a Colon, and divides the Verse into two Parts; at the same Word, as a Member of the long Paragraph, a minor Lord (in this long Train) makes a Semicolon: At the Words *beneath the earth*, the Emperor *Silluk* makes a Period, as closing the Verse; and a major Lord makes a Semicolon in the long Paragraph. Here every Word has two Accents, and each Lord his Train.

Verse 4. At the Words, *neither shalt thou serve them*, the absolute King in Prose, that always makes the first Colon, when a Paragraph is divided into three Parts, makes the first Colon of the long Paragraph; and the Emperor *Atbnach*, makes the Colon that divides the Verse into two Parts. At the Words, *of them that hate me*, the Verse is closed by the Emperor *Silluk*, making a Period; and the Emperor *Atbnach*, makes the second Colon of the long Paragraph.

Here it is to be observed, that the King, or absolute Lord, making the first Colon in the long Paragraph, and the Emperor *Atbnach*, dividing the Verse into two Parts, each Lord has his own Train; and therefore every Word in this Clause is double accented; but the two Emperors being attended by the same Lords and Ministers, their Trains are the same; and therefore none of the Words, except the last, are double accented; because that would have been to have repeated the same Accent twice on the same Letter of the same Word; which would have been useless Tautology.

Verse 5. At the Words, *to the thousandth generation*, the Emperor *Atbnach*, makes a Colon, and divides the Verse into two Parts; but a minor

nor King, or major Lord, makes a Semicolon in the long Paragraph: Both these Stops are so emphatical, as to cause those Words, *to the thousandth generation*, to repeat in the next Clause.

Here it may not be improper by Way of Digression, to take Notice that, as שְׁלֹשִׁים *shileshim*, *threes*, and אַרְבָּעִים *ribbeim*, *fours*, implies the *third and fourth generation*; (and are so rendred in our Version) so אַלָּפִים *alaphim*, *thousands*, implies, and ought to have been rendred, *thousandth generation*; not *thousands* unlimited in Form: But here I presume, that our Translators were led by the Septuagint, who were *no blind leaders of the blind*, but such, who, tho' they could see themselves, led the blind astray. But to return;

The last Clause of the Verse, as closing both the long Paragraph, and the Verse, with a Period, by the Emperor Silluk, requires no double Pointing; and is accordingly accented, with but one accent on a Word.

Pasuch II, and Verse 6, are the same; and therefore there is no double Pointing, nor Accents extraordinary.

Pasuch III, Containing three Propositions, like the first, is divided into four Verses.

Verse 7. At the Words, *so as to sanctify it*; as a Member of the long Paragraph, in this long Train, a minor Lord, makes a Semicolon in both Tables; but as the 7th Verse, the Emperor Silluk makes a Period on the first Tables; and the Emperor *Athnach*, on the second, makes a Colon, dividing the Verse into two Parts:

The latter Part of the 7th Verse, a Clause not inserted in the first Tables, is closed with a *Silluk*, making a Period on the second; but as a Member

ber of the third Paragraph it is accented with a Major Lord, making a Semicolon.

Verse 8. As but one Clause, is accented with two Trains, one attending the Emperor *Silluk*, making a Period, and closing the Verse; the other attending the absolute King in Prose, that never appears, but where a Paragraph is divided into three Parts; and here on both Tables, he makes the first Colon of the third Paragraph.

Now the remaining Part of the third Paragraph, tho' it makes two Verses on both Tables, *viz.* the 9th and the 10th; yet the Words, as well as the Points differing, these two Verses must be handled, first with Relation to the first Tables, and then to the second.

Verse 9. On the first Tables, in the *English* Versions, at the Words, *is a Sabbath*, the Verse is divided into two Parts by a Colon Stop, made by the Emperor *Atbnach* in the *Hebrew*; which Colon is also made at the same Words, and in the same Manner on the second Tables; but as a Member of the third Paragraph, a Major Lord on both Tables, makes a Semicolon: *Thou shalt not do any manner of work thereon*; This Clause is also common to both Tables, and in the same Manner double pointed with Accents on both; the one Train belonging to the Major Lords, whose Trains on the first Tables run to the End of this Verse; where there is a Semicolon in the long Paragraph; and the other Train is that of the Emperor *Silluk*, who closes the Verse with a Period, at the Words, *within thy gates*.

Verse 10. On the first Tables, in the *English* Versions, at the Words, *HE rested*, a Colon Stop made in the *Hebrew* by the Emperor *Atbnach*, both divides the Verse into two Parts, and also makes

makes the second Colon of the third Paragraph ; and therefore there needs no double Accents on the Words : the latter Part of this Verse, being also the last Clause of the third Paragraph, the Emperor *Silluk*, respectively closes both with a Period ; and consequently there are no double Accents here.

Verse 9. On the second Tables ; *Thou shalt not do any manner of work thereon* ; Here the inferior Train runs no farther than through this Clause ; but the Emperors *Atbnach*, and *Silluk*, whose Trains are the same, when of the same Length, run to the Words, *as well as thy self* ; where the Emperor *Silluk*, closes the Verse, and the Emperor *Atbnach*, makes the second Colon of the third Paragraph ; but the intervening Words, have but one Accent on each ; because the same Lords and Ministers are common to each Emperor, at the same Distance from him ; reckoning backward from the Colon to the Beginning of the Verse, or from the End to the Colon, but where the Trains are very unequal, different Majors, Minors and Ministers occur, and meet on the same Word, tho' in one of the Emperors Trains.

Verse 10. On the second Tables ; at the Words, *and with an arm stretched out*, in the *English* Versions, the Verse is divided into two Parts by a Colon Stop made by the Emperor *Atbnach* ; but the third Paragraph at this Clause, is accented in the *Hebrew* with a major Lord, making a Semicolon : The latter Part of this Verse, being also the last Clause of the long Paragraph, the Emperor *Silluk* respectively closes both with a Period ; and therefore there is no double Accents on the Words.

Pasuch iv, and Verse 11, are the same; and therefore there is no double Pointing among the Accents.

Verse 12, is composed of Pasuch or Paragraph v, vi, vii, viii, connected together: The fifth Paragraph being accented at the End, both with a Comma, and a Period; the sixth, both with a Colon and a Period; the seventh, both with a Semicolon and a Period; and here ends all the double accenting of the Decalogue; the eighth Pasuch is only accented at the End with a Period, both as being a distinct Paragraph of it self, and also as closing the Verse; the Train of Accents being exactly the same in both Cases.

I have, Sir, been something prolix, and very particular in describing and explaining the double accenting of the Decalogue, in order to demonstrate that it was done for the Uses, and Purposes above described; as by comparing the duplicate Versions of the Decalogue with each other, will most obviously appear, even to an *English* Reader, entirely ignorant of *Hebrew*: Therefore, as the ten Pasuchs or Paragraphs were wrote both on the first, and on the second Tables, by God himself; they were most certainly pointed with both Vowel and Accent Points, before the thirteen *Silluks*, or Versicles of the Law, were divided by *Moses*; consequently the *Hebrew* Points, both Vowels and Accents, are of Divine Authority; and even of Divine Original too; or else they were prior to the Promulgation of the Law at Mount Sinai. Q. E. D.

Now, tho' the Code hath not an Example of double Pointing like this of the Decalogue, there is in *Gen. xxxv. 22.* a *Parasbet*, or great Paragraph of the Law, that closes very abruptly;

H

and

and is by the Accents, pointed to be read two Ways; viz. either periodically, or as breaking of in the Middle of a Verse, and at a Colon Stop, First, periodically; Thus, “ And it came to pass, during the time that Israel dwelt, in this same country; that Reuben went away; *and he lay with, he even lay with Bilhab, his father’s concubine: And Israel heard.*” The Words above in *Italick*, represent those in the *Hebrew*, that are doubly accented; but according to the other Way of pointing they read thus; “ *And he lay with, he even lay with Bilhab, his father’s concubine; and Israel heard: ******” There being also a Caret marked in the *Hebrew* Text; but the next Words; *Now the sons of Jacob were twelve.* begin the next *Parasbet*, or Chapter, and are no Part of this Verse.

But as it is most probable, if not certain, that all Languages were used by Men, to convey the Sentiments and Ideas of their Minds each to the other in Conversation, before any regular or grammatical Essays were committed to Writing; so who invented the first Alphabet, is a speculative Curiosity worth enquiring into: For so soon as an Alphabet became in Use in any one Language, it was a very easy Thing to adapt it to another; all Alphabets containing near the same Number of Letters, tho’ differently pronounced, and signatred by various Sorts of Characters.

SIR, I have seen a curious * M. S. Essay by
a wor-

* The Manuscript above-mentioned is in the Possession of the Author of The Gentleman’s Magazine; and I should be very glad if some of his curious and learned Correspondents, would prevail with him to publish it, either in his Magazine, or in some of his Lucubrations of Miscellaneous Correspondence.

a worthy and learned Divine now deceased, to prove that, *Moses* was the first Man that wrote with an Alphabet; and that he was taught it by God himself: And thus the first alphabetical Composition of Words ever published to the World in Writing, was wrote by *the finger of God*, on the first Tables at Mount *Sinai*; where during the forty Days that *Moses* tarried in the Mount, he was taught by God, or by an Administration of Angels, both to read what was written, and consequently how to write more in like Manner, or transcribe that. This Supposition both helps to account for *Moses's* long Stay, and also for the Necessity of God's Writing himself: And by this Hypothesis, it follows, that not only, both the Accents and the Vowels too, but the very Letters themselves also, of the *Hebrew* Alphabet, were of Divine Original, and first published to the World by God himself.

F I N I S.

☞ Pafuch III Exodus; Line 6, *for*, whatever, read whatsoever.

Advertisement

AN Y Person desirous of being instructed in the *HEBREW* LANGUAGE, may be waited on, by directing a Letter to the Printer hereof, for the Author.

a worthy and learned Divine now deceased, to
 prove that Moses was the first Man that wrote
 with an Alphabet: and that he was taught it by
 God himself: And that the first alphabetical Com-
 position of Words ever published to the World
 in Writing, was wrote by the finger of God, on
 the first Tables at Mount Sinai: where during the
 forty Days that Moses tarried in the Mount, he
 was taught by God, or by an Administration of
 Angels, both to read what was written, and con-
 siderably how to write more in like Manner, or
 otherwise than the Egyptians had taught him to
 account for himself, and also for the
 Necessity of God's Testament: And by
 this Hypothesis, it follows not only, that
 the Accents and the Letters too, but the very
 Letters themselves also of the Hebrew Alphabet,
 were of Divine Original, and first published to
 the World by God himself.



THE NEW

THE NEW

Advertisement

A NEW Edition of the Hebrew Language, with
 be revised, or by adding a Letter to the
 former Edition, by the Author.